JAN 0 9 2003 E TRADE THE T

PATENT

Attorney Docket No.: 15270J-004764US Client Ref. No.: 209-US-CIP8BC4

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

n January 2, 2003

RECEIVED

JAN 1 0 2003

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP

By: A CASHMURIU L. Celli

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

DALE B. SCHENK et al.

Application No.: 09/724,551

Filed: November 28, 2000

For: PREVENTION AND TREATMENT

OF AMYLOIDOGENIC DISEASE

Examiner:

Sharon L. Turner

Art Unit:

1647

AMENDMENT

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This paper is submitted in response to the Restriction/Election of Species Requirement mailed July 2, 2002. A petition to extend the time to respond for five months, from July 2, 2002 to January 2, 2003 is submitted herewith. Please amend the above-identified application as follows:

Applicant elects Group III, claims 47, 67-68. Applicants elects the following species: 1C, humanized antibodies; 2B, monoclonal antibodies; and, 3B, IgG2 antibodies. Claim 60 recites "administering to the patient an antibody that specifically binds to an epitope within amino acids 1-10 of $A\beta$." Applicants respectfully point out that an antibody that specifically binds to an epitope within amino acids 1-10 of $A\beta$ is not included in the species 4A-H (see ¶8 of the Restriction/Election of Species Requirement). Applicant provisionally elects a species of antibody that specifically binds to an epitope within amino acids 1-10 of $A\beta$.

DALE B. SCHENK et al. Application No.: 09/724,551

Page 2

Claims 47, and 67-68 read on species 1C, humanized antibodies. Claims 47, and 67-68 on species 2B, monoclonal antibodies. Claims 47, and 67-68 read on species 3B, IgG2 antibodies. Claims 47, and 67-68 read on the provisionally elected species.

The election of species requirement directed to a species of antibody that specifically binds to an epitope within $A\beta$ is respectfully traversed on the basis that although the designated species may be patentably distinct they are not mutually exclusive. MPEP 806.04(f) specifies that "[c]laims to be restricted to different species must be mutually exclusive." Here, it is noted that the claims specify that an antibody binds to a particular species of $A\beta$ but do not in general require that the antibody be raised against the same species of $A\beta$ to which it binds. Therefore, antibodies that bind to $A\beta$ 1-10 (as recited claim 60) include antibodies that bind to $A\beta$ 4-10, for example, as recited in claim 61 or antibodies that bind to $A\beta$ 8-10, as recited in claim 62. Because the election of species requirement requires election between nonmutually exclusive species, it is submitted that it should be withdrawn.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

semaine I. Celli

Rosemarie L. Celli Reg. No. 42,397

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP Two Embarcadero Center, 8th Floor San Francisco, California 94111-3834

Tel: 650-326-2400 Fax: 650-326-2422

RLC:lah PA 3273152 v1